

REMARKS

This Amendment is in response to the Office Action mailed on October 21, 2003, in which Claims 1-12 and 15-19 were rejected. With this Amendment, Claims 1, 6, and 12 are amended. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the present application in view of the foregoing amendments and in view of the reasons which follow.

I. Rejection of Claims 1-12 and 15-19 Under 35 U.S.C. § 112.

In Section 2 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 1-12 and 15-19 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. In particular, the Examiner noted that the term "a base" in Claims 1, 6, and 12 is "vague and indefinite as to what disclosed structure it refers." Further, the Examiner noted that "structural cooperation has not been positively set for 'a spring arm', particularly with respect to the blade" in Claims 1, 6, and 12.

Applicant has amended the specification, claims, and drawings to address the Examiner's rejections. In particular, Applicant has amended the specification to recite "a base 71, from which extends a spring arm 72" and "a spring arm 272 extending from a base 271," with reference to Figs. 3 and 7. Applicant has amended Figures 3 and 7 to include the new reference numerals 71 and 271. Applicant respectfully asserts that no new matter has been added to the application as the structure now referred to as a "base" in the specification and claims was originally shown in the drawings in the relationship now described in the specification (a base from which a spring arm extends).

Applicant has amended Claims 1, 6, and 12 to recite "the spring arm adapted to lock the blade into an operative position" in order to address the Examiner's assertion that structural cooperation between the spring arm and the blade has not been recited in the claims. Applicant refers to page 8, lines 20-24, for specification support of the claim amendments ("the spring arm 72 snaps into position behind the tang 32 . . . the blade 12 is prevented from rotating back toward its folded position. Thus the liner lock 16 locks the blade 12 into its operative position"). In view of the above amendments, Applicant presents Claims 1-12 and 15-19 for reconsideration and allowance.

II. Amendments to the Drawings.

Applicant has amended Figures 3 and 7 to add reference numerals 71 in Fig. 3 and 271 in Fig. 7. Applicant has included formal drawing replacement sheets with this Amendment. Applicant requests that the replacement sheets be entered into the application.

III. Conclusion.

Claims 1-12 and 15-19 are pending in the present application. Claims 13 and 14 are withdrawn. With this reply, Claims 1, 6, and 12 are amended. Applicant believes that the present application is now in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration of the application as amended, is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is felt that a telephone interview would advance the prosecution of the present application.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required regarding this application under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16-1.17, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 06-1447. Should no proper payment be enclosed herewith, as by a check being in the wrong amount, unsigned, post-dated, otherwise improper or informal or even entirely missing, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the unpaid amount to Deposit Account No. 06-1447. If any extensions of time are needed for timely acceptance of papers submitted herewith, Applicant hereby petitions for such extension under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 and authorizes payment of any such extensions fees to Deposit Account No. 06-1447.

Respectfully submitted,

Date 1/20/04

By 

FOLEY & LARDNER
Customer Number: 26371
Telephone: (414) 297-5897
Facsimile: (414) 297-4900

Jeffrey S. Gundersen
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 47,619

Amendments to the Drawings:

Please amend Figures 3 and 7 as discussed in the Remarks section. Applicant has attached replacement sheets with the amended Figures.